

Expected Coalescence Time for a Nonuniform Allocation Process

John K. McSweeney*, Boris G. Pittel^{†‡}
 Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University

November 10, 2008

Abstract

We study a process where balls are repeatedly thrown into n boxes independently according to some probability distribution $\mathbf{p}$. We start with n balls, and at each step all balls landing in the same box are fused into a single ball; the process terminates when there is only one ball left (coalescence). Let $c := \sum_j p_j^2$, the collision probability of two fixed balls. We show that the expected coalescence time is asymptotically $2c^{-1}$, under two constraints on $\mathbf{p}$ that exclude a thin set of distributions $\mathbf{p}$. One of the constraints is $c \ll \ln^{-2} n$. This $\ln^{-2} n$ is shown to be a threshold value: for $c \gg \ln^{-2} n$, there exists $\mathbf{p}$ with $c(\mathbf{p}) = c$ such that the expected coalescence time far exceeds c^{-1} . Connections to coalescent processes in population biology and theoretical computer science are discussed.

AMS 2000 Subject classifications. Primary 60C05; secondary 05A15, 60F10, 60J05, 65K10, 68W40, 92D25.

Key Words and Phrases. Coalescence, most recent common ancestor, generalized Wright-Fisher model, random functions, Markov chain, asymptotic behavior

Remark. All limits in this paper are taken as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and we use Landau notation o, ω, O in the usual sense. We say that an event A holds with high probability (whp) if $P(A^c) = o(1)$, and we denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$.

1 Introduction

We consider the following balls-into-boxes process. Let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ be any probability vector. At time $t = 0$, start with b_0 balls and throw them into n boxes, where each ball has probability p_j of landing in box j , independently of all other balls. Fuse all balls that land in the same box, and then repeat the allocation at times $t = 1, 2, \dots$ according to the same rules with this possibly smaller new number of balls. The random time T at which all balls are first fused into a single one is called the *coalescence* time; we will be mainly interested in its asymptotic expected value.

This problem has been studied in various guises by numerous authors. Initially, it was stated in terms of finding the Most Recent Common Ancestor (MRCA) in a random genealogical process. We will restrict ourselves to the balls-into-boxes formulation here, but it is important to note that any of the results we obtain here can be recast in the language of population biology; we will occasionally provide the reader the appropriate analogy. The seminal work in this area was done by Kingman [7, 8, 9] who, for fixed b_0 , proved convergence of the underlying process to the continuous-time

*Research partially supported by an NSF VIGRE fellowship. Email: mcsweeney@math.ohio-state.edu

[†]Research supported by an NSF grant. Email: bgp@math.ohio-state.edu

[‡]Postal Address (both authors): Ohio State University, Department of Mathematics, 231 W 18th ave, Columbus, OH 43210

coalescent process, thereby establishing convergence of the distribution of $T/E[T]$. In [7] he also proved that for $b_0 = n$ and the uniform distribution $\mathbf{p} = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$,

$$E[T] \leq 2n - 2,$$

which effectively implies that

$$E[T] \sim 2n, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.1)$$

More recently, Donnelly and Tavaré [3], Möhle [12], and Möhle and Sagitov [14] have studied the limiting behavior of more general classes of allocation (reproduction) models for b_0 fixed. In [13], Möhle considered the case $b_0 \rightarrow \infty$ as well for several models, which however do not include the one at hand.

There is a good deal of literature on continuous-time coalescent processes that bears mentioning. For large times t , when the number of balls is small, we should expect relatively long time intervals during which no collisions happen, likely punctuated by binary (one-on-one) collisions. This behavior is characteristic of Kingman-type coalescent processes, and admits a natural time scaling to a continuous-time process. More recently, the theory of Λ - and Ξ -coalescents, developed by Pitman, Sagitov, and Schweinsberg [15, 19, 20], among others, allows for models involving multiple simultaneous collisions. Indeed, in our model, for small times t , we are likely to have multiple simultaneous collisions, however these happen at *fixed* time intervals. There is therefore no natural time-scaling that can be performed in order to interpret this behavior in the limit as a continuous-time process with random collision times.

The process can also be described in terms of compositions of random functions: choose random functions $\{f_s : [n] \rightarrow [n]\}_{s \in \mathbf{N}}$ independently, in such a way that for all $i \in [n]$, and for all $s \in \mathbf{N}$, $f_s(i) = j$ with probability p_j , independently for all i and s . The coalescence time T is then the smallest value of t for which $f_t \circ \dots \circ f_2 \circ f_1$ is a constant function. It is this formulation that has been used in connection with computer science: this problem is potentially useful in bounding the running time of so-called ‘Coupling from the Past’ (CFTP) algorithms introduced by Propp and Wilson [17, 18]; see Section 6 for a brief discussion of this. Motivated by this connection, and apparently unaware of Kingman’s work for the uniform distribution, Dalal and Schmutz [2] established (1.1); Fill [4] and Goh et al. [6] derived the limiting distribution of $T/E[T]$.

For $b_0 = n$, Adler et al. [1, Theorem 4] were able to extend Kingman’s result (1.1) to a nonuniform $\mathbf{p}$, showing that

$$E[T] \sim 2c_2^{-1}, \quad c_2 := \sum_j p_j^2, \quad (1.2)$$

(note that $c_2 = 1/n$ for the uniform $\mathbf{p}$), under the condition

$$\frac{c_3}{c_2} < \frac{3}{n}, \quad c_3 := \sum_j p_j^3. \quad (1.3)$$

Here c_2, c_3 are the probabilities of a double collision and a triple collision respectively. In essence, (1.3) means that $\mathbf{p}$ is sufficiently close to $(1/n, \dots, 1/n)$.

We should expect the largest contribution to the time T to happen during the late stages of the process, when the number of balls is relatively small. In this case, any reduction in the number of balls will most likely be due to the collision of a single pair of balls. This explains the appearance of c_2 in (1.2). (In fact, c_2 had been used as a scaling parameter for a wide class of models by Möhle in [12] in the context of population genetics.) The bound (1.3) on c_3 ensures that, if in one of those late stages the number of balls has dropped, then the actual decrease is exactly 1 with conditional probability sufficiently close to 1.

The proof in [1] revealed that the expected time spent in the *late* stages was about $2c_2^{-1}$ under conditions far less restrictive than (1.3). (1.3) was used in [1] to show that the expected time spent in the *early* stages was $o(c_2^{-1})$.

In this paper we prove that this property of the process and (1.2) continue to hold for a much wider class of distributions $\mathbf{p}$. Here is our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $b_0 = n$. Suppose that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ however small,*

$$c_2 = o(\ln^{-2} n) \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 \leq c_2^{3/2} \ln^{-(1/2+\varepsilon)} n. \quad (1.4)$$

Then (i)

$$E[T] = 2c_2^{-1}(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.5)$$

and (ii)

$$\frac{T}{E[T]} \Rightarrow \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{2}{k(k-1)} Y_k, \quad (1.6)$$

where Y_k are independent and exponentially distributed, $P(Y_k > x) = e^{-x}$.

Remarks.

1. It is always the case that $c_2 \leq 1$ and $c_3 \leq c_2^{3/2}$; so if not for the logarithmic factors, the conditions (1.4) would not have excluded any probability vectors $\mathbf{p}$. Further, $c_2^{3/2}/(n^{-1}c_2) \geq n^{1/2}$, since $c_2 \geq n^{-1}$ for all $\mathbf{p}$. This means that the restriction $c_3/c_2 < 3/n$ in [1] is much more stringent than $c_3 \leq c_2^{3/2} \ln^{-(1/2+\varepsilon)} n$ in our Theorem 1.1.
2. The lower bound in (1.5), $E[T] \geq 2c_2^{-1}(1 - o(1))$, holds for any $\mathbf{p}$ as long as $c_2 \rightarrow 0$. This can be deduced from [1, Theorem 2] via an elementary coupling argument; we will provide a brief proof in Section 4. Therefore, our main task is to prove a matching upper bound.
3. For the case of the uniform $\mathbf{p} = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$, (1.6) follows from Kingman's work. Independently, it was proved later—in a setup close to that of our paper—by Fill [4]; still later Goh et al. [6] gave a detailed description of the cdf of the limiting distribution.
4. Part (ii) of Theorem 1.1 follows from part (i), via an argument very similar to Fill's proof for the uniform case; cf. Theorem 6.1 of Möhle [13].

Interestingly, $\ln^{-2} n$ appearing as the upper bound for c_2 in Theorem 1.1 is a genuine threshold for the property “ $E[T]$ is of order c_2^{-1} exactly”:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $b_0 = n$. For $c_2 = \omega(\ln^{-2} n)$, there exists a probability vector $\mathbf{p}$ with $\sum_j p_j^2 = c_2$ such that with high probability, $T = \omega(c_2^{-1})$, and thus $E[T] = \omega(c_2^{-1})$.*

Adler et al. [1, Theorem 5] had proved that $E[T] \rightarrow \infty$ for a probability vector satisfying conditions ensuring that $\lim c_2 > 0$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we bound the expected time spent during an early phase. We achieve this by showing that whp, for certain “small” values of t , the *stochastic* process is well-approximated by a *deterministic* process, amenable to sharp estimates. To that end we will build on the method used by Pittel [16] for asymptotic analysis of a rumor-spreading process introduced and studied by Frieze and Grimmett [5]. In Section 3, we bound the expected time spent in a “middle” phase and a “late” phase, showing that the late phase contributes, overwhelmingly, to the total number of steps. In section 4 we prove the lower bound for Theorem 1.1. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.2. In the appendix we prove some auxiliary inequalities needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 The expected duration of an early phase

Let the distribution $\mathbf{p}$ be given. Assume that $b_0 = n$. For $t \in \mathbf{N}$, we denote by $B(t)$ the random number of balls at time t , so that $B(0) = n$. In the language of the genealogical process, $B(t)$ is the number of individuals at generation $-t$ which have a descendant alive in the current generation 0. We denote by $\tau(k)$ the random first time t when $B(t)$ falls below k , i. e. $\tau(k) = \min\{t \geq 0 : B(t) \leq k\}$. The coalescence time T is therefore $\tau(1)$. Obviously, $\{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain on the state space $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, so we will refer to $B(t)$ as the *state* at time t .

Notice that, by the definition of the stochastic sequence $\{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$,

$$E[B(t+1)|B(t) = k] = \sum_{j=1}^n [1 - (1 - p_j)^k] , \quad B(0) = n,$$

because the probability of box j receiving at least one ball out of k allocated balls is $1 - (1 - p_j)^k$. It would seem natural to try to prove that the conditional distribution of $B(t+1)$ is concentrated around $E[B(t+1)|B(t) = k]$, as long as k is large enough. Curiously, we will be able to show instead that for smallish t , whp $B(t+1)$ is relatively close to $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t))$, where

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) := \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - e^{-p_j k}). \quad (2.1)$$

Note that $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t))$ is close to $E[B(t+1)|B(t)]$ when most of $p_j B(t)$ are small, which may not be the case when $B(t)$ is relatively close to n .

Here is an outline of our argument. We introduce $k_* = o(c_2^{-1})$, and a recurrence inequality which the random sequence $B(t)$ is believed to satisfy whp as long as $B(t)$ is above k_* . Assuming that the inequality does hold, we derive efficient bounds for $\tau(k_*)$. Lastly we show that indeed whp, $\{B(t)\}_{t \leq \tau(k_*)}$ satisfies the recurrence inequality.

2.1 Variational problems

In order to determine the likely decline of $\{B(t)\}$, we need to bound $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ from above for a certain range of k . This task seems quite hard, since $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ depends on all n components of $\mathbf{p}$ in a rather complicated way. Remarkably, the worst case bounds will do the job quite efficiently, because the worst distribution $\mathbf{p}$ turns out to be much simpler than a feasible generic $\mathbf{p}$.

Let us define D_n to be the set of probability n -vectors. For any $\mathbf{q} \in D_n$, define

$$F_{\mathbf{q}}(k) := \sum_{j=1}^n e^{-k q_j}, \quad (2.2)$$

so that $\Phi_{\mathbf{q}}(k) = n - F_{\mathbf{q}}(k)$, and set

$$D(c_2) := \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in D_n \mid \sum_j q_j^2 = c_2 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad D(c_2, c_3) := \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in D_n \mid \sum_j q_j^2 = c_2, \sum_j q_j^3 = c_3 \right\}.$$

That is, $D(c_2)$ (resp. $D(c_2, c_3)$) is the set of probability vectors that share the same sum of squares (resp., squares and cubes) as $\mathbf{p}$. When dealing with $D(c_2)$, $D(c_2, c_3)$, we will assume that $c_2 > 1/n$; otherwise these sets are reduced to a point $(1/n, \dots, 1/n)$. The functional $F_{\mathbf{q}}(k)$ is continuous and the sets D_n , $D(c_2)$ and $D(c_2, c_3)$ are compact, so the infima of F (as a function of $\mathbf{q}$, for fixed k) over these sets are attained.

Proposition 2.1. *For any $k \in [n]$,*

$$\min_{\mathbf{q} \in D_n} F_{\mathbf{q}}(k) = F_{\mathbf{u}}(k),$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the uniform vector $\mathbf{u} = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$.

Proposition 2.2. *For any $k \in [n]$,*

$$\min_{\mathbf{q} \in D(c_2)} F_{\mathbf{q}}(k) = F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)}(k),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2) = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ has the property that $\theta_1 > \theta_2 = \dots = \theta_n$ (when listed in nonincreasing order). That is, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ has only two distinct entries, and the larger one has support size equal to 1. We

will refer to such vectors as being of “topheavy” type. Using the equations $\theta_1 + (n-1)\theta_2 = 1$ and $\theta_1^2 + (n-1)\theta_2^2 = c_2$, we can explicitly express the two entries of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{(n-1)(c_2n-1)}}{n}, \quad \theta_2 = \frac{1 - \theta_1}{n-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Proposition 2.3. For any $k \in [n]$,

$$\min_{\mathbf{q} \in D(c_2, c_3)} F_{\mathbf{q}}(k) = F_{\mathbf{r}(c_2, c_3)}(k),$$

where $\mathbf{r}(c_2, c_3) := (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n)$ (when ordered in nonincreasing order) has the following property: for some $\nu \in [n]$,

$$r_1 = \dots = r_\nu \geq r_{\nu+1} > r_{\nu+2} = \dots = r_n. \quad (2.4)$$

That is, $\mathbf{r}(c_2, c_3)$ has at most 3 distinct entries, and the middle one (if any) has support size equal to 1.

Clearly, $D_n \supset D(c_2) \supset D(c_2, c_3)$, and so $F_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \geq F_{\mathbf{r}(c_2, c_3)}(k) \geq F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)}(k) \geq F_{\mathbf{u}}(k)$. These propositions therefore provide sharper and sharper estimates, so at various junctures we will use whichever one is easiest to work with, while still being sharp enough.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Using the fact that $\varphi(x) = e^{-x}$ is concave up,

$$F_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \sum_j e^{-p_j k} = n \sum_j \frac{1}{n} e^{-p_j k} \geq n \exp\left(-\sum_j \frac{1}{n} p_j k\right) = n e^{-k/n} = F_{\mathbf{u}}(k).$$

□

Proofs of Propositions 2.2 and 2.3. To prove Proposition 2.2, there are two steps:

1. Show that a minimizer $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of $F_{\mathbf{q}}(k)$ on $D(c_2)$ cannot have a configuration $\theta_{j_1} > \theta_{j_2} > \theta_{j_3}$; that is, that it cannot have three distinct entries.
2. Show that a minimizer $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ cannot have a $\theta_{j_1} = \theta_{j_2} > \theta_{j_3}$ configuration ($j_i \in [n]$), which will imply that the larger entry is unique.

We will only prove Proposition 2.3 as it is more difficult; the interested reader would not find it difficult to adapt the argument to prove Proposition 2.2.

We may recast Proposition 2.3 as follows: letting $z_j := q_j k$, we want to minimize $G(\mathbf{z}) := \sum_j e^{-z_j}$ under the constraints

$$\sum_j z_j = k, \quad \sum_j z_j^2 = k^2 c_2, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_j z_j^3 = k^3 c_3. \quad (2.5)$$

Our task is to show that the minimizer $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $G(\mathbf{z})$, with components listed in nonincreasing order, must have the form $x_1 = \dots = x_\nu \geq x_{\nu+1} > x_{\nu+2} = \dots = x_n$ for some $\nu \in [n]$. To this end, we show first that a minimizer of $G(\mathbf{z})$ has at most four distinct components (Case I), and second, that an entry value which is strictly intermediate is encountered exactly once (Case II). Our proof does not rely on the method of Lagrange multipliers, because its applicability for the equality constraints needs a prior justification and because, in principle, it may deliver only a “first-order” necessary condition, definitely too crude to handle Case II.

Case I. We first show that a minimizer of $G(\mathbf{z})$ cannot have four distinct entries. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that we have a minimizing vector $\mathbf{x}$ for which there exist j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 (relabel as 1, 2, 3, 4) such that $x_1 > x_2 > x_3 > x_4 \geq 0$. Let $y_j = x_j + \varepsilon_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, 4$, and $y_j = x_j$ for $j = 5, \dots, n$; we will show that for a suitable choice of $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_4)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ satisfies the conditions (2.5), and $G(\mathbf{y}) < G(\mathbf{x})$, and thus such an $\mathbf{x}$ cannot be a minimizer on the set $D(c_2, c_3)$.

First note that we require $\varepsilon_4 \geq 0$ because of the possibility that $x_4 = 0$, but $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$ can be of either sign. For $\mathbf{y}$ to satisfy the conditions (2.5), we require

$$\sum_{j=1}^4 \varepsilon_j = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$2 \sum_{j=1}^4 x_j \varepsilon_j + \sum_{j=1}^4 \varepsilon_j^2 = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

$$3 \sum_{j=1}^4 x_j^2 \varepsilon_j + 3 \sum_{j=1}^4 x_j \varepsilon_j^2 + \sum_{j=1}^4 \varepsilon_j^3 = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Now we want $G(\mathbf{x}) - G(\mathbf{y}) > 0$; by linearizing the $e^{-\varepsilon_j}$ factors, it will be sufficient (by taking the ε_j as small as we wish) to show that

$$e^{-x_1} \varepsilon_1 + e^{-x_2} \varepsilon_2 + e^{-x_3} \varepsilon_3 + e^{-x_4} \varepsilon_4 > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We now obtain expressions for the ε_j . For given x_j , the system (2.6)-(2.8) is a system of 3 *nonlinear* equations in 4 unknowns $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_4$; treating ε_4 as a parameter, we hope to be able to solve it uniquely for $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$ near $(0, 0, 0)^T$. Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} := (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3)^T$, and write (2.6)-(2.8) as the vector equation

$$\mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\varepsilon_4), \quad \mathbf{b}(\varepsilon_4) := (-\varepsilon_4, -2x_4\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_4^2, -3x_4^2\varepsilon_4 - 3x_4\varepsilon_4^2 - \varepsilon_4^3)^T.$$

The derivative (Jacobian) matrix of $\mathbf{f}$ at $\mathbf{0}$ is

$$L := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2x_1 & 2x_2 & 2x_3 \\ 3x_1^2 & 3x_2^2 & 3x_3^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its determinant is equal to $6\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, where $\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is the Vandermonde determinant for x_1, x_2, x_3 ,

$$\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_2 - x_1)(x_3 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2),$$

which is non-zero (negative), as the x_i are distinct (decreasing). Therefore, by the Inverse Vector Function Theorem (IVFT), for $|\varepsilon_4|$ sufficiently small there exists a differentiable solution $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon_4)$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(0) = \mathbf{0}$, such that

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \gamma \varepsilon_4 + \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_4^2), \quad \gamma := L^{-1} \mathbf{b}'(0) = L^{-1}(-1, -2x_4, -3x_4^2)^T.$$

Explicitly, by Cramer's rule,

$$\gamma_1 = -\frac{\Delta(x_4, x_2, x_3)}{\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3)}, \quad \gamma_2 = -\frac{\Delta(x_1, x_4, x_3)}{\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3)}, \quad \gamma_3 = -\frac{\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_4)}{\Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3)}.$$

With these formulas, (2.9) is equivalent to showing (by letting $\varepsilon_4 > 0$ be as small as needed)

$$e^{-x_4} \Delta(x_1, x_2, x_3) < e^{-x_1} \Delta(x_4, x_2, x_3) + e^{-x_2} \Delta(x_1, x_4, x_3) + e^{-x_3} \Delta(x_1, x_2, x_4),$$

which in turn is equivalent to showing that

$$D(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{vmatrix} e^{-x_1} & e^{-x_2} & e^{-x_3} & e^{-x_4} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ x_1^2 & x_2^2 & x_3^2 & x_4^2 \end{vmatrix} > 0.$$

By using the operations typical for computation of the Vandermonde-type determinants, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{x}) &= - \begin{vmatrix} e^{-x_2} - e^{-x_1} & e^{-x_3} - e^{-x_1} & e^{-x_4} - e^{-x_1} \\ x_2 - x_1 & x_3 - x_1 & x_4 - x_1 \\ x_2^2 - x_1^2 & x_3^2 - x_1^2 & x_4^2 - x_1^2 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= e^{-x_1} \prod_{i=2}^4 (x_i - x_1) \times \begin{vmatrix} \lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_3) & \lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_4) \\ x_3 - x_2 & x_4 - x_2 \end{vmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda(x) := (e^x - 1)/x$. Next, we factor $x_3 - x_2$ and $x_4 - x_2$ from the first column and from the second column. So, introducing

$$C(\mathbf{x}) := e^{-x_1} \prod_{i=2}^4 (x_i - x_1) \prod_{i=3}^4 (x_i - x_2) < 0,$$

we then get

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{x}) &= C(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \left| \frac{\frac{\lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_3)}{x_3 - x_2}}{1} \quad \frac{\frac{\lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_4)}{x_4 - x_2}}{1} \right| \\ &= C(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \left[\frac{\lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_3)}{(x_1 - x_2) - (x_1 - x_3)} - \frac{\lambda(x_1 - x_2) - \lambda(x_1 - x_4)}{(x_1 - x_2) - (x_1 - x_4)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Now $\lambda(x)$ is concave up for $x > 0$. Therefore, since

$$0 < x_1 - x_2 < x_1 - x_3 < x_1 - x_4,$$

the quantity in square brackets in (2.10) is strictly negative, by considering its terms to be slopes of secant lines to the graph of $\lambda(x)$. Using this and $C(\mathbf{x}) < 0$, we get the desired conclusion, i.e. $D(\mathbf{x}) > 0$.

Case II. Now we show that a vector $\mathbf{x}$ with a configuration $x_1 > x_2 = x_3 > x_4 \geq 0$ cannot be a minimizer of G either. Define $x := x_2 = x_3$. Now that $\mathbf{f}'(\mathbf{0})$ is singular, determination of small feasible $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_4$ such that $G(\mathbf{y}) < G(\mathbf{x})$ is more of a challenge. The fact that the linear terms in (2.6)-(2.8) now depend on only $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_4$ hints that $|\varepsilon_1|, |\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3|, |\varepsilon_4|$ should be equally small, and that $|\varepsilon_2|$ and $|\varepsilon_3|$, while small, should be much larger.

Believing in this scenario, we set

$$\varepsilon_1 = \delta_1 \varepsilon^2, \quad \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon + \delta_2 \varepsilon^2, \quad \varepsilon_3 = -\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon_4 = \delta_4 \varepsilon^2,$$

and seek the feasible $\delta_i(\varepsilon)$ for small ε . To begin with, we again require $\delta_4 \geq 0$. The conditions (2.6)-(2.8) become

$$\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_4 = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

$$x_1 \delta_1 + x \delta_2 + x_4 \delta_4 = -1 + \varepsilon b_2(\varepsilon, \boldsymbol{\delta}), \quad (2.12)$$

$$x_1^2 \delta_1 + x^2 \delta_2 + x_4^2 \delta_4 = -2x + \varepsilon b_3(\varepsilon, \boldsymbol{\delta}), \quad (2.13)$$

where the $b_i(\varepsilon, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ are polynomials. Notice that $\Delta := \Delta(x_1, x, x_4)$, the determinant of the matrix in (2.11)-(2.13), is nonzero. So for $|\varepsilon|$ small enough, there exists a differentiable solution $\boldsymbol{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, such that $\boldsymbol{\delta}(0)$ is the solution of (2.11)-(2.13) with 0, -1 , and $-2x$ respectively on the right hand side. By Cramer's rule,

$$\delta_1(0) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{vmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & x & x_4 \\ -2x & x^2 & x_4^2 \end{vmatrix}, \quad \delta_2(0) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ x_1 & -1 & x_4 \\ x_1^2 & -2x & x_4^2 \end{vmatrix}, \quad \delta_4(0) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ x_1 & x & -1 \\ x_1^2 & x^2 & -2x \end{vmatrix},$$

which gives

$$\delta_1(0) = \frac{(x - x_4)^2}{\Delta}, \quad \delta_2(0) = \frac{(x_1 - x_4)(x_1 + x_4 - 2x)}{\Delta}, \quad \delta_4(0) = -\frac{(x - x_1)^2}{\Delta}.$$

Reassuringly, $\delta_4(0)$ is positive (because Δ is negative). Again we want $G(\mathbf{x}) - G(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) > 0$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{x}) - G(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) &= \sum_{j=1}^4 (1 - e^{-\varepsilon_j}) e^{-x_j} \\ &= e^{-x_1} (1 - e^{-\varepsilon_1}) + e^{-x} (1 - e^{-\varepsilon_2} + 1 - e^{-\varepsilon_3}) + e^{-x_4} (1 - e^{-\varepsilon_4}) \\ &= e^{-x_1} (\delta_1 \varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^4)) \\ &\quad + e^{-x} (\varepsilon + \delta_2 \varepsilon^2 - (1/2)(\varepsilon + \delta_2 \varepsilon^2)^2 + O(\varepsilon^3) - \varepsilon - (1/2)\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^3)) \\ &\quad + e^{-x_4} (\delta_4 \varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^4)) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 (\delta_1 e^{-x_1} + (\delta_2 - 1) e^{-x} + \delta_4 e^{-x_4} + O(\varepsilon)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Thus, by taking ε sufficiently small, (2.14) will be > 0 if

$$\delta_1(0)e^{-x_1} + (\delta_2(0) - 1)e^{-x} + e^{-x_4}\delta_4(0) > 0.$$

In light of the formulas for the $\delta_i(0)$ and the fact that $\Delta < 0$, this is equivalent to

$$T(\mathbf{x}) := -(x - x_4)^2 e^{-x_1} + (\Delta - (x_1 - x_4)(x_1 + x_4 - 2x))e^{-x} + (x - x_1)^2 e^{-x_4} > 0. \quad (2.15)$$

Now multiplying $T(\mathbf{x})$ by e^x and using the inequalities

$$e^{-(x_1 - x)} < 1 - (x_1 - x) + (x_1 - x)^2/2, \quad e^{x - x_4} > 1 + (x - x_4) + (x - x_4)^2/2,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^x T(\mathbf{x}) &= (x - x_4)^2 (1 - e^{x - x_1}) + (x - x_1)^2 (e^{x - x_4} - 1) + \Delta \\ &> (x - x_4)^2 \left((x_1 - x) - \frac{(x_1 - x)^2}{2} \right) + (x - x_1)^2 \left((x - x_4) + \frac{(x - x_4)^2}{2} \right) + \Delta \\ &= (x - x_4)^2 (x_1 - x) + (x - x_1)^2 (x - x_4) + (x - x_1)(x_4 - x_1)(x_4 - x) \\ &= 0. \quad (!) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (2.15) holds, and thus as before, $\mathbf{x}$ cannot be a minimizer, and this concludes Case II.

This only leaves the possibility that the minimizer $\mathbf{x}$ of G is of the form

$$x_1 = x_2 = \cdots = x_\nu \geq x_{\nu+1} \geq x_{\nu+2} = \cdots = x_n,$$

and thus that the minimizer $\mathbf{r}$ of $F_{\mathbf{q}}(k)$ over $D(c_2, c_3)$ is of the form (2.4), for any k . This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.3. $\square$

2.2 Identifying and iterating a likely recurrence inequality

Let

$$k_* := c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n, \quad (2.16)$$

with ε coming from (1.4). (k_* is meant to be an integer, as is another parameter k_1 defined later, but for simplicity we omit the “integer part” notation.) This k_* will serve as a threshold separating the “early” states ($B(t) > k_*$) from the “late” states ($B(t) \leq k_*$). So, in light of the informal discussion in the introduction, “ $k_* = o(c_2^{-1})$ ” should be more or less expected; the need for an additional factor, $\ln^{-\varepsilon} n$, will become clear later, in Section 3.

Our immediate task is to identify a function $\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$, such that, intuitively at least, the random sequence $\{B(t)\}$ whp satisfies a recurrence inequality

$$B(t+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t)), \quad \text{if } B(t) \geq k_*. \quad (2.17)$$

Then, for $k \geq k_*$, $\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ needs to be large enough so that, conditionally on $\{B(t) = k\}$, the event $\{B(t+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t))\}$ is very likely. Since we think that $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ defined in (2.1) is a “sharp” conditional predictor of $B(t+1)$, we must have $\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) > \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$. Also, to be of any use, $\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ must fall below k . Last, but not least, we must be able to solve a chosen recurrence. The function

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \frac{1}{2}(k + \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)) = \frac{1}{2}(k + n - F_{\mathbf{p}}(k)), \quad (2.18)$$

with $F_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ as defined in (2.2), happens to meet all three requirements.

Define an event

$$\Delta := \{\forall t : B(t) \geq k_* \implies B(t+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t))\}.$$

In Section 2.5 we will show that $P(\Delta) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In this section, assuming that the event Δ holds, we solve the recurrence (2.17) and estimate sharply $\tau(k_*)$, the first moment t when $B(t) \leq k_*$.

Lemma 2.4. *On the event Δ ,*

$$\tau(k_*) \leq 5c_2^{-1/2} \ln n = o(c_2^{-1}).$$

Proof. The proof is divided into two cases.

Case I. $c_2 \geq 2n^{-1}$. First of all, by Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \leq \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)}(k) \quad \forall k \in [n],$$

$\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)$ being the topheavy distribution $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_2)$ with parameter c_2 . Therefore on the event Δ ,

$$B(t+1) \leq \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)}(B(t)), \quad \forall t \leq \tau(k_*). \quad (2.19)$$

Let us bound $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)}(B(t))$ from above. Since $c_2 \geq 2n^{-1}$, we get, using (2.3),

$$\theta_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}c_2^{1/2} \Rightarrow \theta_2 \leq \frac{1 - (1/2)c_2^{1/2}}{n-1}. \quad (2.20)$$

By (2.20) and

$$\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(B(t)) = \frac{1}{2}(B(t) + n - e^{-\theta_1 B(t)} - (n-1)e^{-\theta_2 B(t)}),$$

we have (using the inequality $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$)

$$\begin{aligned} B(t+1) &\leq \frac{1}{2}(B(t) + n - 0 - (n-1)(1 - \theta_2 B(t))) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(B(t) + (1 - c_2^{1/2}/2)B(t) + 1\right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

$$\leq \left(1 - \frac{c_2^{1/2}}{4}\right) B(t) + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.22)$$

a *linear* recurrence inequality. (Implicit in this derivation is an intuition that, for the distribution $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in question, a large enough proportion of collisions happen in box 1, and that we may disregard collisions in boxes $2, \dots, n$ without inducing too large an error.) It follows from (2.22) and $B(0) = n$ that

$$B(t) \leq n \left(1 - \frac{c_2^{1/2}}{4}\right)^t + 2c_2^{-1/2} \quad \text{for } B(t) \geq k_*. \quad (2.23)$$

To get a bound on $\tau(k_*)$, notice that

$$k_* < B(\tau(k_*) - 1) \leq n \left(1 - \frac{c_2^{1/2}}{4}\right)^{\tau(k_*)-1} + 2c_2^{-1/2} \quad (2.24)$$

and let $\tau := \tau(k_*) - 1$. Now $c_2^{-1/2} = o(k_*)$ if $c_2 = o(\ln^{-2\varepsilon} n)$, which is certainly implied by (1.4). So we can crudely use the bound $2c_2^{-1/2} \leq (1/2)k_*$ in (2.24) to get

$$(1/2)k_* \leq n(1 - c_2^{1/2}/4)^\tau \leq n \exp\left(-c_2^{1/2}\tau/4\right).$$

Taking logarithms and solving for τ , we obtain

$$\tau \leq 4(\ln n + \ln c_2 + \varepsilon \ln \ln n + \ln 2) c_2^{-1/2} \leq 5c_2^{-1/2} \ln n.$$

Hence $\tau(k_*) = o(c_2^{-1})$, since $c_2 = o(\ln^{-2} n)$, which is the first condition in (1.4).

Case II. $c_2 \leq 2n^{-1}$. This time $\boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)$ is too close to being uniform, and the inequality (2.21) is too crude. A bit of reflection shows that we should not expect that $B(t)$ decay exponentially here. We show instead that, for some absolute constant A ,

$$B(t) \leq \frac{An}{t+1}, \quad t \leq \tau(k_*). \quad (2.25)$$

The proof is by induction. The case $t = 0$ holds if $A \geq 1$. Suppose (2.25) holds for some t . Observe that

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \sum_{j=1}^n \psi(p_j k), \quad \psi(x) := \frac{1}{2}(x + 1 - e^{-x}),$$

and that $\psi(x)$ is increasing and concave down. Then by the inductive assumption,

$$B(t+1) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \psi(p_j B(t)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \psi\left(p_j \frac{An}{t+1}\right) \leq n\psi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j \frac{An}{t+1}\right) = n\psi\left(\frac{A}{t+1}\right).$$

So we need to find $A \geq 1$ such that

$$\psi\left(\frac{A}{t+1}\right) \leq A/(t+2), \quad (2.26)$$

or, defining $x := A/(t+1)$,

$$\psi(x) \leq x \frac{t+1}{t+2} \iff 1 - e^{-x} \leq x \left(1 - \frac{2}{t+2}\right). \quad (2.27)$$

We therefore define $x(t)$ implicitly by

$$1 - e^{-x(t)} = x(t) \left(1 - \frac{2}{t+2}\right); \quad (2.28)$$

by considering the graphs of the functions of $x(t)$ on the left- and right-hand sides of (2.28), it is clear that $x(t)$ is well-defined and decreasing (to 0) in t . Therefore (2.27) is satisfied iff $x \geq x(t)$. It is not difficult to show that

$$x(t) \sim \frac{4}{t+2}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty,$$

and so $A_* := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} (t+1)x(t)$ is finite. Thus to satisfy (2.26) and thereby to complete the inductive proof, we can pick $A = \max\{1, A_*\}$.

Therefore, on the event Δ , we have

$$k_* < B(\tau(k_*) - 1) \leq \frac{An}{\tau(k_*)}$$

which we can invert to get

$$\tau(k_*) \leq \frac{An}{k_*} = 2A \ln^\varepsilon n,$$

which is certainly $o(c_2^{-1/2} \ln n)$. Combining this with the case $c_2 \geq 2/n$, we have $\tau(k_*) = O(c_2^{-1/2} \ln n)$ on the event Δ . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4. $\square$

2.3 Exponential tail bounds

We need to show that $P(\Delta)$ converges to 1, and that it does so sufficiently fast.

To this end, and also for Theorem 1.2, we establish two-sided exponential tail bounds for the distribution of $B(t+1)$ conditioned on $B(t)$. Like Chernoff bounds for sums of i.i.d. random variables, the bounds are based on a generating function approach for estimating the probabilities of large deviations.

Let $\pi_{kb} := P(B(t+1) = b | B(t) = k)$, and note that $\pi_{kb} = 0$ for $k < b$. Introduce the tail probabilities

$$\pi_{kb}^- = P(B(t+1) < b | B(t) = k) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{kb}^+ = P(B(t+1) > b | B(t) = k).$$

Theorem 2.5.

$$\pi_{kb}^- \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp \left[-\frac{(\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - b)^2}{2k} \right], \quad b \leq \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \quad (2.29)$$

and

$$\pi_{kb}^+ \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp \left[-\frac{(b - \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k))^2}{2k} \right], \quad b \geq \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k). \quad (2.30)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The heart of the proof is an expression for π_{kb} by means of generating functions. As usual, the expression $[y^m]f(y)$ denotes the coefficient of y^m in the power series expansion of $f(y)$.

Lemma 2.6.

$$\pi_{kb} = \frac{k!}{n^k} [x^k z^b] \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j x} - 1)) \right), \quad 1 \leq b \leq k \leq n.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{kb} &= P(B(t+1) = b | B(t) = k) \\ &= \sum_{U \subset [n], |U|=b} P(k \text{ balls go into exactly the boxes indexed by } U) \\ &= \sum_U \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_b = k \\ \varepsilon_j > 0 \ \forall j \in [b]}} P(\text{each box } j \text{ from } U \text{ gets } \varepsilon_j \text{ balls}) \\ &= \sum_U \sum_{\vec{\varepsilon}} \binom{k}{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \dots \varepsilon_b} \prod_{j \in U} p_j^{\varepsilon_j} \\ &= k! \sum_U \sum_{\vec{\varepsilon}} \prod_{j \in U} \frac{p_j^{\varepsilon_j}}{\varepsilon_j!}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we build a *bivariate* generating function for the probabilities π_{kb} . Start with the k index. Incorporating for future convenience an n^k factor, we have

$$\sum_k \pi_{kb} \frac{n^k}{k!} x^k = \sum_U \sum_k \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_b = k \\ \varepsilon_j > 0}} \prod_{j \in U} \frac{(nx)^{\varepsilon_j} p_j^{\varepsilon_j}}{\varepsilon_j!}.$$

We merge the second and third sums, yielding for the right-hand side

$$\sum_U \sum_{\varepsilon_j > 0} \prod_{j \in U} \frac{(nx)^{\varepsilon_j} p_j^{\varepsilon_j}}{\varepsilon_j!}.$$

Reversing the order of summation and multiplication, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \pi_{kb} \frac{n^k}{k!} x^k &= \sum_U \prod_{j \in U} \sum_{\varepsilon=1}^{\infty} \frac{(nx p_j)^{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon!} \\ &= \sum_U \prod_{j \in U} (\exp(np_j x) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by z^b and summing for $b \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_b \sum_k \pi_{kb} \frac{n^k}{k!} x^k z^b &= \sum_b z^b \sum_{|U|=b} \prod_{j \in U} (\exp(np_j x) - 1) \\
&= \sum_{U \subset [n]} z^b \prod_{j \in U} (\exp(np_j x) - 1) \\
&= \sum_{U \subset [n]} \prod_{j \in U} z(\exp(np_j x) - 1) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^n [1 + z(\exp(np_j x) - 1)].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\pi_{kb} \frac{n^k}{k!} = [x^k z^b] \prod_{j=1}^n [1 + z(\exp(np_j x) - 1)]$$

and from here the lemma follows. $\square$

By Lemma 2.6,

$$g_k(z) := E[z^{B(t+1)} | B(t) = k] = \sum_{b=1}^k \pi_{kb} z^b = \frac{k!}{n^k} [x^k] \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j x} - 1)).$$

Now, for $b \leq k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
z^b \pi_{kb}^- &= \sum_{i=1}^b \pi_{ki} z^b \leq \sum_{i=1}^b \pi_{ki} z^i \leq g_k(z), \quad 0 < z \leq 1, \\
z^b \pi_{kb}^+ &= \sum_{i=b+1}^k \pi_{ki} z^b \leq \sum_{i=b+1}^k \pi_{ki} z^i \leq g_k(z), \quad z \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\pi_{kb}^- \leq \frac{g_k(z)}{z^b} = \frac{k!}{z^b n^k} [x^k] \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j x} - 1)), \quad \text{for } 0 < z \leq 1, \quad (2.31)$$

$$\pi_{kb}^+ \leq \frac{g_k(z)}{z^b} = \frac{k!}{z^b n^k} [x^k] \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j x} - 1)), \quad \text{for } z \geq 1. \quad (2.32)$$

Since the coefficients of the products in (2.31)-(2.32) are nonnegative, we use the inequality $[x^k]f(x) \leq f(x)/x^k$ ($\forall x > 0$) to obtain

$$\pi_{kb}^- \leq \frac{k!}{z^b (nr)^k} \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)), \quad \forall r > 0, \quad 0 < z \leq 1, \quad (2.33)$$

$$\pi_{kb}^+ \leq \frac{k!}{z^b (nr)^k} \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)), \quad \forall r > 0, \quad z \geq 1. \quad (2.34)$$

Our task is to get the most out of these bounds (2.33)-(2.34) by choosing values for z and r judiciously. We use Stirling's formula $k! \leq 3\sqrt{k}(k/e)^k$ to transform the product-type formulas (2.33) and (2.34) into

$$\pi_{kb}^- \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp(H(z, r, b)), \quad z \leq 1, \quad (2.35)$$

$$\pi_{kb}^+ \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp(H(z, r, b)), \quad z \geq 1, \quad (2.36)$$

where

$$H(z, r, b) := k \ln \left(\frac{k}{rne} \right) - b \ln(z) + \sum_j \ln(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)). \quad (2.37)$$

For a given b , we want to use a stationary point of $H(z, r, b)$, i.e. a solution to

$$H_z = -\frac{b}{z} + \sum_j \frac{e^{np_j r} - 1}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)} = 0, \quad (2.38)$$

$$H_r = -\frac{k}{r} + z \sum_j \frac{np_j e^{np_j r}}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)} = 0. \quad (2.39)$$

This complicated system has a simple solution $(z_*, r_*) = (1, k/n)$ for

$$b = b_* := n - \sum_j e^{-p_j k} (= \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)).$$

Moreover, from (2.37) it is immediate that $H(z_*, r_*, b_*) = 0$. This is a first sign that the inequalities (2.35)-(2.36) may indeed lead to meaningful explicit bounds for $\pi_{kb}^{\pm}$. Of course, we need to know that (2.38)-(2.39) has a solution (z, r) for $b \neq b_*$ as well, such that $z < 1$ for $b < b_*$, and $z > 1$ for $b > b_*$.

Observe that

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} H_{zz} & H_{zr} \\ H_{rz} & H_{rr} \end{pmatrix} = H_{zz}H_{rr} - H_{zr}^2 > 0,$$

for every solution (z, r) of (2.38)-(2.39) (see Lemma A.1 in the appendix for a proof of this). So, by the implicit vector function theorem, there exists an infinitely differentiable solution $(z(b), r(b))$ of (2.38)-(2.39), such that

$$(z(b_*), r(b_*)) = (z_*, r_*).$$

Moreover, $z(b)$ is strictly increasing (see (A.13) in the appendix), so that indeed $z(b) < 1$ for $b < b_*$, and $z(b) > 1$ for $b > b_*$. So, introducing

$$h(b) = H(z(b), r(b), b), \quad (2.40)$$

we have

$$\pi_{kb}^- \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp(h(b)), \quad b < b_*, \quad (2.41)$$

$$\pi_{kb}^+ \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp(h(b)), \quad b > b_*; \quad (2.42)$$

here $h(b_*) = H(z_*, r_*, b_*) = 0$.

To get efficient bounds from (2.41)-(2.42), let us approximate $h(b)$ by its Taylor polynomial about b_* . First, using (2.38)-(2.39),

$$\begin{aligned} h'(b) &= \frac{d}{db} H(z(b), r(b), b) \\ &= H_z(z(b), r(b), b) z'(b) + H_r(z(b), r(b), b) r'(b) + H_b(z(b), r(b), b) \\ &= H_b(z(b), r(b), b) = -\ln(z(b)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

It follows that $h(b)$ is unimodal (concave down, in fact), attaining its zero maximum at $b = b_*$. Consequently

$$h(b) = h(b_*) + h'(b_*)(b - b_*) + \frac{h''(\tilde{b})}{2} (b - b_*)^2 = \frac{h''(\tilde{b})}{2} (b - b_*)^2, \quad (2.44)$$

$\tilde{b}$ being between b and b_* . It is shown in the appendix (Lemma A.2) that

$$h''(\tilde{b}) \leq -\frac{1}{k}.$$

This bound and (2.41), (2.42), (2.44) imply (2.29) and (2.30), thereby concluding the proof of Theorem 2.5. $\square$

2.4 Using the exponential tail bounds

For the upper bound, we will need (2.30), which gives, for $b = \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ (recall the definition (2.18) of $\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$),

$$\pi_{k, \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)}^+ \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp \left[-\frac{(\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k))^2}{2k} \right] \quad (2.45)$$

$$= 3\sqrt{k} \exp \left[-\frac{(k - \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k))^2}{8k} \right]. \quad (2.46)$$

Introducing

$$H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) := \frac{1}{k} (\Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k))^2,$$

we rewrite (2.45) as

$$\pi_{k, \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)}^+ \leq 3\sqrt{k} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \right). \quad (2.47)$$

The next Lemma states, roughly, that the larger k is, the more likely it is that the next state $B(t+1)$ is close to the prediction based on information $B(t) = k$.

Lemma 2.7. *For all k and $\mathbf{p}$, $H_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$ is increasing in k .*

Proof. Define

$$N_{\mathbf{p}}(k) := \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - \Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \frac{1}{2} \left(k - n + \sum_{j=1}^n e^{-p_j k} \right)$$

so that $H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = k^{-1} N_{\mathbf{p}}(k)^2$. Then

$$H'_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{p}}(k)}{k^2} [2k N'_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - N_{\mathbf{p}}(k)],$$

where

$$2k N'_{\mathbf{p}}(k) - N_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (p_j k + 1 - (2p_j k + 1)e^{-p_j k}) > 0,$$

because

$$f(x) := x + 1 - (2x + 1)e^{-x} > x + 1 - \frac{2x + 1}{x + 1} = \frac{x^2}{x + 1} > 0 \quad \text{for } x > 0.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.7. □

Lemma 2.8. *For all $k \in \{k_*, \dots, n\}$,*

$$H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \geq A_* \ln^{1+\varepsilon} n,$$

where A_* is some absolute constant. Thus the probability in (2.47) is superpolynomially small.

Proof. Consider first the case $c_2 \geq 2n^{-1}$. From Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.7, it follows that, for all $k \geq k_*$, $H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \geq H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*) \geq H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*)$; here

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) &= (\Psi_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) - \Phi_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*))^2 / k_* \\ &= \frac{1}{4k_*} \left[\sum_{j=1}^n (e^{-r_j k_*} - 1 + r_j k_*) \right]^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4k_*} \left[\nu(e^{-r_1 k_*} - 1 + r_1 k_*) \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

To bound (2.48) from below we need to have sharp bounds for r_1 and ν . Recalling the definition of $\mathbf{r}$ in Lemma 2.3, and letting $\mu := n - \nu - 1$, we have

$$\nu r_1 + r_2 + \mu r_3 = 1, \quad \nu r_1^2 + r_2^2 + \mu r_3^2 = c_2, \quad \nu r_1^3 + r_2^3 + \mu r_3^3 = c_3. \quad (2.49)$$

Obviously $r_3 \leq n^{-1}$. Since we assume that $c_2 \geq 2n^{-1}$, we also have

$$c_3 \geq c_2^2 \geq \frac{4}{n^2}.$$

Hence

$$\mu r_3^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{c_2}{2}, \quad \mu r_3^3 \leq \frac{\mu}{n^3} \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{c_3}{4}. \quad (2.50)$$

Combining (2.49), (2.50) and $r_2 \leq r_1$ we get

$$\frac{c_2}{4} \leq \nu r_1^2 \leq c_2, \quad \frac{3c_3}{8} \leq \nu r_1^3 \leq c_3. \quad (2.51)$$

These double inequalities imply directly that

$$\frac{3}{8} \frac{c_3}{c_2} \leq r_1 \leq 4 \frac{c_3}{c_2}, \quad \frac{1}{64} \frac{c_2^3}{c_3^2} \leq \nu \leq \frac{64}{9} \frac{c_2^3}{c_3^2}. \quad (2.52)$$

Armed with (2.52) we return to (2.48). Recalling that $k_* = c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n$, we need to consider separately the subsequences $\{n_i\}$ such that $r_1 k_* = O(1)$ for $n \in \{n_i\}$, and the subsequences $\{n_i\}$ along which $r_1 k_* \rightarrow \infty$. In the first case

$$\inf_{n_i} \frac{e^{-r_1 k_*} - 1 + r_1 k_*}{r_1^2 k_*^2} \geq \delta > 0.$$

So, using (2.51), we obtain from (2.48):

$$H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4} \nu^2 r_1^4 k_*^3 \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4} (\nu r_1^2)^2 c_2^{-3} \ln^{-3\varepsilon} n \geq \frac{\delta^2}{64} c_2^{-1} \ln^{-3\varepsilon} n.$$

In the second case, for n_i large enough,

$$e^{-r_1 k_*} - 1 + r_1 k_* \geq \frac{1}{2} r_1 k_*.$$

So, using (2.51) again and (2.52),

$$H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) \geq \frac{1}{16} \nu^2 r_1^2 k_* = \frac{1}{16} \nu (\nu r_1^2) k_* \geq \frac{1}{2^{12}} \frac{c_2^3}{c_3^2} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n.$$

Therefore there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that, for n large enough,

$$H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) \geq A \min \left\{ c_2^{-1} \ln^{-3\varepsilon} n, \frac{c_2^3}{c_3^2} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n \right\},$$

for if there weren't, there would be a subsequence $\{r_1 k_*(n_j)\}_{j \geq 1}$ along which this did not hold. This subsequence would then have a further subsequence which tended to infinity, or remained bounded, which would contradict the bound for one of the two cases established above. Since

$$c_3 \leq c_2^{3/2} \ln^{-(1/2+\varepsilon)} n, \quad c_2 \leq C \ln^{-2} n$$

for some large enough constant C , the last inequality leads to

$$H_{\mathbf{r}}(k_*) \geq A \ln^{1+\varepsilon} n,$$

for n large enough, as long as $\varepsilon < 1/4$, which of course we may assume without loss of generality.

Consider now the case $c_2 \leq 2n^{-1}$. This time, by Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.7, for all $k \geq k_* = c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n$,

$$H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \geq H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*) \geq H_{\mathbf{u}}(k_*),$$

where

$$H_{\mathbf{u}}(k_*) = \frac{1}{4k_*} \left(k_* - n + ne^{-k_*/n} \right)^2 \geq \frac{k_*^3}{36n^2} \geq \frac{1}{288} n \ln^{-3\varepsilon} n.$$

(For the first inequality we used

$$e^{-x} - 1 + x \geq \frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{x^3}{6} \geq \frac{x^2}{3}, \quad \text{for } x \in (0, 1).)$$

Thus $H_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \omega(\ln^{1+\varepsilon} n)$ for this case, and this concludes the proof of Lemma 2.8. $\square$

2.5 Validation of the deterministic approximation

Now that we have established the (superpolynomially) small bound for $\pi_{k, \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)}^+$, we can finally show that the event Δ is extremely likely indeed.

Lemma 2.9. *For some constant $A > 0$,*

$$P(\Delta) \geq 1 - 12n \ln n \exp(-A \ln^{1+\varepsilon} n) \geq 1 - n^{-K}, \quad \forall K > 0, \quad n \geq n(K).$$

Remark. Borrowing a term from Knuth et al. [10], the event Δ holds quite surely (q.s.).

Proof. Introduce the events

$$C_t = \left\{ B(s+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(s)) \quad \forall s < t, \quad B(t+1) > \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(t)), B(t) \geq k_* \right\};$$

that is, C_t is the event that the recursive inequality $B(s+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(s))$ is violated at a state $B(t) \geq k_*$, and t is the first such moment. Clearly

$$\Delta^c = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} C_t.$$

Let us show that

$$C_t = \emptyset, \quad \forall t \geq t_* := 4c_2^{-1/2} \ln n.$$

Suppose that on the contrary $C_{t_1} \neq \emptyset$ for some $t_1 > t_*$. Then, by the definition of C_{t_1} , we have

$$B(s+1) \leq \Psi_{\mathbf{p}}(B(s)), \quad \forall s \leq t_*,$$

and certainly $B(t_*) \geq k_*$. However, using this recurrence inequality exactly as in the derivation of (2.23), we must have

$$\begin{aligned} B(t_*) &\leq n \left(1 - c_2^{1/2}/4 \right)^{t_*} + 2c_2^{-1/2} \\ &\leq n \exp \left[- \left(4c_2^{-1/2} \right) (\ln n) \left(c_2^{1/2}/4 \right) \right] + 2c_2^{-1/2} \\ &= 1 + 2c_2^{-1/2} < k_* \end{aligned}$$

since $c_2 = o(\ln^{-2\varepsilon} n)$. Contradiction! Thus Δ^c is a union of at most t_* events C_t . Now by (2.45) and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$P(C_t) \leq 3n^{1/2} \exp(-H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*)/2), \quad t \geq 0,$$

since $B(t) \geq k_*$ on C_t . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\Delta^c) &= P\left(\bigcup_{t \leq t_*} C_t\right) \leq \sum_{t \leq t_*} P(C_t) \\
&\leq 3t_* n^{1/2} \exp(-H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*)/2) \\
&= 12c_2^{-1/2} n^{1/2} \ln n \exp(-H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*)/2) \\
&\leq 12n \ln n \exp(-H_{\mathbf{p}}(k_*)/2) \\
&\leq 12n \ln n \exp(-0.5A_* \ln^{1+\varepsilon} n) \quad \text{by Lemma 2.8,}
\end{aligned}$$

and from here the lemma follows. $\square$

This completes a program we put forth at the end of the introduction. Combining Lemma 2.4 and this last Lemma 2.9, we have proved the following.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $k_* = c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon} n$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ however small, and let $\tau(k_*)$ denote the random moment when $B(t)$ falls to or below k_* for the first time. Then, for some constant $a > 0$,*

$$P\{\tau(k_*) \leq ac_2^{-1/2} \ln n\} \geq 1 - n^{-K}, \quad \forall K > 0, \quad n \geq n(K).$$

In short, q.s. $\tau(k_*) = o(c_2^{-1})$.

2.6 Bounding the expectation of $\tau(k_*)$

Even though $\tau(k_*) = o(c_2^{-1})$ q.s., proving that $E[\tau(k_*)] = o(c_2^{-1})$ as well is not straightforward, since we do not have a polynomial (worst-case) bound for $\tau(k_*)$. As a first step, introducing the event indicators I_Δ , I_{Δ^c} , we split $E[\tau(k_*)]$ using $1 = I_\Delta + I_{\Delta^c}$ and bound the second summand via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\tau(k_*)] &= E[\tau(k_*)I_\Delta] + E[\tau(k_*)I_{\Delta^c}] \\
&\leq 5(\ln n)c_2^{-1/2} + \sqrt{E[\tau^2(k_*)] \cdot E[I_{\Delta^c}^2]} \\
&\leq 5(\ln n)c_2^{-1/2} + \sqrt{E[\tau^2(k_*)] \cdot \sqrt{P(\Delta^c)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

It remains to show that $E[\tau^2(k_*)]$ is at most polynomially large. To do so, introduce T_k , the random time the process $\{B(t)\}$ spends at state k , i.e.

$$T_k = |\{t \geq 0 : B(t) = k\}|. \tag{2.54}$$

Then

$$\tau^2(k_*) = \left(\sum_{k=k_*+1}^n T_k\right)^2 \leq (n - k_*) \sum_{k=k_*+1}^n T_k^2,$$

again by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Therefore

$$E[\tau^2(k_*)] \leq n \sum_{k=k_*+1}^n E[T_k^2] \leq n \sum_{k=k_*+1}^n E[T_k^2 | T_k > 0].$$

Recalling the notation $\pi_{kk} = P(B(t+1) = k | B(t) = k)$, we observe that

$$P\{T_k = j | T_k > 0\} = \pi_{kk}^{j-1} (1 - \pi_{kk}), \quad j > 0,$$

i.e. conditioned on $\{T_k > 0\}$, T_k is geometrically distributed, with success probability $1 - \pi_{kk}$. In particular,

$$E[T_k | T_k > 0] = \frac{1}{1 - \pi_{kk}}, \quad \text{Var}[T_k | T_k > 0] = \frac{\pi_{kk}}{(1 - \pi_{kk})^2}.$$

It is obvious intuitively, and can be easily proved, that π_{kk} decreases with k : the larger the number of balls—the larger the probability of collision. Consequently both conditional moments of T_k decrease with k . So

$$\begin{aligned} E[\tau^2(k_*)] &\leq n \sum_{k=k_*+1}^n \left(\frac{\pi_{kk}}{(1-\pi_{kk})^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\pi_{kk})^2} \right) \\ &\leq n \sum_{k=k_*+1}^n \frac{2}{(1-\pi_{kk})^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2n^2}{(1-\pi_{k_*k_*})^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

Therefore, it remains to show only that $\frac{1}{1-\pi_{k_*k_*}}$ is at most polynomially large in n . Using the simplest *lower* bound for the probability of the union of events, via the inclusion-exclusion formula, we write

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \pi_{kk} &= P(\text{there is a collision during a } k\text{-allocation}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\{a,b\} \subset [k]} P(\text{balls } a \text{ and } b \text{ collide}) - \sum_{\{c,d\} \neq \{e,f\} \subset [k]} P(c, d \text{ collide and } e, f \text{ collide}) \\ &\geq \binom{k}{2} c_2 - \left(\binom{k}{3} c_3 + \frac{1}{2} \binom{k}{2} \binom{k-2}{2} c_2^2 \right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

$$= \binom{k}{2} c_2 \left(1 - a_1 k \frac{c_3}{c_2} - a_2 k^2 c_2 \right). \tag{2.57}$$

where a_1, a_2 are some absolute constants. The two rightmost terms of (2.56) are due to the fact that there are two ways in which two distinct pairs of balls can collide: either the two pairs overlap at one ball or they are disjoint. Now introduce $k_1 := c_2^{-1/2} \ln^{-\varepsilon/4} n$; clearly $k_1 < k_*$, and we also have

$$\lim k_1 \frac{c_3}{c_2} = 0, \quad \lim k_1^2 c_2 = 0.$$

So, by (2.57), uniformly for all $k \leq k_1$,

$$\frac{1}{1-\pi_{kk}} \leq \frac{1}{\binom{k}{2} c_2} (1 + o(1)). \tag{2.58}$$

Consequently

$$\frac{1}{1-\pi_{k_*k_*}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\pi_{k_1k_1}} = O(k_1^{-2} c_2^{-1}) = O(\ln^{\varepsilon/2} n), \tag{2.59}$$

which is sufficient. Thus by (2.53) and (2.55),

$$E[\tau(k_*)] = O(c_2^{-1/2} \ln n) = o(c_2^{-1}). \tag{2.60}$$

3 Bounding expected duration of a middle phase and a late phase

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 it remains to bound the expected duration of the process after the number of balls has dropped below k_* .

We define a middle phase as $[\tau(k_*), \tau(k_1))$, the time interval during which the number of balls is below k_* and above k_1 . Using the T_k defined in (2.54), we have

$$E[\tau(k_1) - \tau(k_*)] = \sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_*} E[T_k] \leq \sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_*} \frac{1}{1-\pi_{kk}}.$$

Then, by decreasing monotonicity of $(1 - \pi_{kk})^{-1}$ and (2.59),

$$E[\tau(k_1) - \tau(k_*)] \leq \frac{k_* - k_1}{1 - \pi_{k_1 k_1}} = O(c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2} n) = O(c_2^{-1} \ln^{-\varepsilon/2} n) = o(c_2^{-1}). \quad (3.1)$$

(The last computation explains at long last why we needed the $\ln^{-\varepsilon} n$ factor in the definition (2.16) of k_* .)

Naturally, we define a late phase as $[\tau(k_1), \tau(1)]$. By (2.58),

$$E[\tau(1) - \tau(k_1)] \leq 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{k_1} \frac{1 + o(1)}{c_2 \binom{k}{2}} = 2c_2^{-1}(1 + o(1)), \quad (3.2)$$

where we used

$$\frac{1}{k(k-1)} = \frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{k}, \quad k \geq 2.$$

That does it! Adding the estimates (2.60), (3.1), and (3.2), we obtain

$$E[\tau(1)] \leq 2c_2^{-1}(1 + o(1)).$$

4 Lower Bound

We now provide the matching lower bound for Theorem 1.1. We will not need assumptions on $\mathbf{p}$ as strong as (1.4); rather we will simply assume that $c_2(\mathbf{p}) \rightarrow 0$.

For any $m \leq n$, let $T(m)$ denote the coalescence time for the process starting with m balls (we have so far been considering the case $T := T(n)$.) We start by stating Theorem 2 from [1]:

$$\text{For any } \mathbf{p}, \quad E[T(m)] \geq 2c_2^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m} - \frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{12} \frac{c_3}{c_2} \right). \quad (4.1)$$

To get a bound on $T(n)$, first note the obvious-looking fact that

Proposition 4.1. *Let $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq n$. Then for any $\mathbf{p}$, $T(m_2)$ stochastically dominates $T(m_1)$.*

Proof. This is a result of the following basic coupling argument: start with m_2 balls, m_1 of which are marked. Then perform the usual allocation process; the time X at which all balls coalesce is distributed as $T(m_2)$, and at this time certainly all marked balls have coalesced as well; call the time that these marked balls have first coalesced Y , so that $X \geq Y$ and Y is distributed as $T(m_1)$. From here the result follows. $\square$

This result shows that for the bound $E[T(n)] \geq 2c_2^{-1}(1 - o(1))$, it is sufficient to show $E[T(m)] \geq 2c_2^{-1}(1 - o(1))$ for some $m \leq n$. By the inequalities

$$c_2^2 \leq c_3 \leq c_2^{3/2} \implies c_2 \leq \frac{c_3}{c_2} \leq c_2^{1/2},$$

we have that $c_2 \rightarrow 0$ iff $c_3/c_2 \rightarrow 0$. Let $m_* := (c_2/c_3)^{1/3}$, say; then $m_* \rightarrow \infty$ since we assume that $c_2 \rightarrow 0$, and so (4.1) becomes

$$E[T(m_*)] \geq 2c_2^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m_*} - O(m_*^2 m_*^{-3}) \right) = 2c_2^{-1}(1 - o(1)),$$

and the result follows by Proposition 4.1. The proof Theorem 1.1 is complete.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We start by restating Theorem 1.2 in a more detailed manner.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $b_0 = n$. Suppose $c_2 = (\ln^{-2} n)\lambda(n)$, where $\lambda(n) \rightarrow \infty$ however slowly. Set $\mathbf{p} = \boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)$, i.e. $\mathbf{p}$ is the topheavy distribution $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_2)$ with*

$$\theta_1^2 + (n-1)\theta_2^2 = c_2.$$

Then for the process evolving according to this $\mathbf{p}$, whp

$$\tau(1) \geq c_2^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20};$$

so, in particular, $E[\tau(1)] = \omega(c_2^{-1})$.

Remarks.

1. Our choice of $\mathbf{p}$ should be expected. Indeed, the recurrence inequality (2.19) signals, intuitively, that the coalescent process for $\mathbf{p} = \boldsymbol{\theta}(c_2)$ is a good candidate for being the slowest among all $\mathbf{p}$ with $\sum_j p_j^2 = c_2$.
2. In Theorem 5 of [1], Adler et al. had proved that for $\max_j p_j$ bounded away from 0, and the remaining p_j uniformly small, the expected coalescence time exceeds c_2^{-1} by a factor of $\ln n$.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. For simplicity we let $c := c_2$. For $\mathbf{p} = \boldsymbol{\theta}(c)$, the Markov chain is almost as simple as that for the uniform $\mathbf{p}$. Indeed, given $B(t)$, the number of balls that land in box $2, \dots, n$ (call it $\hat{B}(t)$) is binomially distributed with parameters $B(t)$ and success probability $1 - \theta_1$, i. e. $\hat{B}(t) = \text{Bin}(B(t), 1 - \theta_1)$ in short. Conditioned on $\hat{B}(t)$, we have a uniform allocation of $\hat{B}(t)$ balls among $n - 1$ boxes $2, \dots, n$. And, for $B(t)$ sufficiently large, whp $\hat{B}(t) \sim (1 - \theta_1)B(t)$. So, based on our experience with deterministic approximations earlier in the paper, we should expect that—after fusing balls that landed in the same box—these $\hat{B}(t)$ balls give birth to about

$$(n-1) \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\hat{B}(t)}{n-1}\right) \right] \sim (n-1) \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\theta_1)B(t)}{n-1}\right) \right]$$

balls for next generation. All the balls that landed in box 1, if there are any, will coalesce into one ball. Ignoring this box for now, we expect then that the process $\{B(t)\}$ whp “closely” obeys a recurrence inequality of the form

$$B(t+1) \geq (n-1)\varphi\left(\frac{(1-\theta_1)B(t)}{n-1}\right), \quad \varphi(x) := 1 - e^{-x}.$$

Here is a precise claim.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\gamma := 1 - 2c^{1/2} < 1 - \theta_1$ and introduce*

$$\Psi(k) = (n-1) \eta\left(\frac{\gamma k}{n-1}\right), \quad \eta(x) := 1.5\varphi(x) - 0.5x.$$

Then, for n sufficiently large,

$$P(B(t+1) < \Psi(B(t)) \mid B(t) = k) \leq e^{-kc/3} + e^{-k^3/73n^2}. \quad (5.1)$$

Remark. $\eta(0) = 0$, $\eta(x) \leq \varphi(x)$, and $\eta(x)$ is increasing for $x \leq \ln 3$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Notice first that

$$B(t+1) \geq \mathcal{R}(t+1),$$

where $\mathcal{R}(t+1)$ is the number of boxes among $2, \dots, n$ that host at least one of $\hat{B}(t)$ balls. Denoting $P(\{\cdot\} | B(t) = k)$ by $P_k(\{\cdot\})$, we have then

$$\begin{aligned} P_k(B(t+1) < \Psi(k)) &\leq P_k(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k)) \\ &\leq P_k(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k), \hat{B}(t) \geq \gamma k) + P_k(\hat{B}(t) < \gamma k). \end{aligned}$$

Now, denoting the c.d.f. of $\mathcal{R}(t+1)$ conditioned on $\{\hat{B}(t) = j\}$ by F_j , we have: for $j_1 < j_2$,

$$F_{j_2}(x) \leq F_{j_1}(x), \quad \forall x \geq 0.$$

(Informally, the fewer balls we allocate among the boxes $2, \dots, n$, the fewer nonempty boxes we end up with.) Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P_k(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k), \hat{B}(t) \geq \gamma k) &= \sum_{j \geq \gamma k} P(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k) | \hat{B}(t) = j) P_k(\hat{B}(t) = j) \\ &\leq P(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k) | \hat{B}(t) = \lceil \gamma k \rceil) \sum_{j \geq \gamma k} P_k(\hat{B}(t) = j) \\ &\leq P(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k) | \hat{B}(t) = \lceil \gamma k \rceil). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} P_k(B(t+1) < \Psi(k)) &\leq \mathcal{P}_1 + \mathcal{P}_2, \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &:= P_k(\mathcal{R}(t+1) < \Psi(k) | \hat{B}(t) = \lceil \gamma k \rceil), \\ \mathcal{P}_2 &:= P_k(\hat{B}(t) < \gamma k). \end{aligned}$$

Using the Chernoff bound for the tail of binomial distribution (see Mitzenmacher and Upfal [11], for instance), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_2 &= P(\text{Bin}(k, 1 - \theta_1) < \gamma k) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{kp\delta^2}{2}\right) \Big|_{p=1-\theta_1, \delta=1-\gamma(1-\theta_1)^{-1}} \\ &\leq e^{-kc/3}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

as $\theta_1 \sim c_2^{1/2}$, from the definition (2.3) of θ_1, θ_2 .

Turn to $\mathcal{P}_1$. Applying Theorem 2.5 to the boxes set $\{2, \dots, n\}$ and the uniform distribution $\mathbf{u}$ on this set, we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_1 \leq 3\sqrt{\gamma k} \exp\left(-\frac{(\Phi_{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma k) - \Psi(k))^2}{2\gamma k}\right).$$

Here, using the definition of $\eta(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma k) - \Psi(k) &= (n-1)\varphi\left(\frac{\gamma k}{n-1}\right) - (n-1)\eta\left(\frac{\gamma k}{n-1}\right) \\ &= \frac{(n-1)}{2} \left[\frac{\gamma k}{n-1} - \varphi\left(\frac{\gamma k}{n-1}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So, as

$$x - \varphi(x) = e^{-x} - 1 + x \geq \frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{x^3}{6} \geq \frac{x^2}{3}, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

we have

$$\mathcal{P}_1 \leq 4\sqrt{\gamma k} \exp\left(-\frac{(\gamma k)^4}{72\gamma k(n-1)^2}\right) \leq e^{-k^3/73n^2}. \tag{5.3}$$

The estimates (5.2)-(5.3) imply (5.1), thereby completing the proof of the lemma. $\square$

To continue, let $\hat{k} := n^{3/4}$. Introduce two events,

$$\Gamma := \{\forall t, B(t) \geq \hat{k} \implies B(t+1) \geq \Psi(B(t))\},$$

and

$$\Pi := \{\exists t > c^{-3/2} : B(t) \geq \hat{k}\}.$$

On the event Γ , $B(t)$ does not decrease “too quickly” as long as $B(t)$ is above $\hat{k}$. On the event Π , $\tau(\hat{k}) \geq c^{-3/2}$, i. e. $\tau(\hat{k}) = \omega(c^{-1})$. Then, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Gamma^c \cap \Pi^c) &\leq P\left\{\bigcup_{t=0}^{c^{-3/2}} \{B(t+1) < \Psi(B(t)), B(t) \geq \hat{k}\}\right\} \\ &\leq (1 + c^{-3/2}) \left(e^{-\hat{k}c/3} + e^{-\hat{k}^3/73n^2}\right) \\ &= (1 + c^{-3/2}) \left(e^{-n^{3/4}c/3} + e^{-n^{1/4}/73}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

i. e. $P(\Gamma \cup \Pi) \rightarrow 1$.

If we show that $\tau(\hat{k}) = \omega(c^{-1})$ on the event Γ as well, we will be able then to claim that whp $\tau(\hat{k}) = \omega(c^{-1})$, and the proof of Theorem 5.1 will be complete.

To do so, we observe that on the event Γ ,

$$x(t+1) \geq \eta(\gamma x(t)), \quad x(t) := \frac{B(t)}{n-1}, \quad x(0) = 1 - (n-1)^{-1}, \quad (5.4)$$

as long as

$$x(t) \geq \frac{\hat{k}}{n-1} \sim n^{-1/4}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $n \geq 3$. Under the recurrence (5.4),*

$$x(t) \geq \frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^t}{t+1}. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. The argument runs in parallel to that for the *lower* bound of $B(t)$ in (2.25). The base case $t = 0$ is just

$$x(0) = 1 - n^{-1} \geq \frac{2}{3}.$$

Suppose (5.5) holds for some t . Since $\eta(x)$ is increasing for $x \leq \ln 3$, (5.4) implies that

$$x(t+1) \geq \eta\left(\gamma \frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^t}{t+1}\right) = \eta\left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^{t+1}}{t+1}\right).$$

So, to complete the inductive step, we need to show that

$$\eta(y) \geq y \frac{t+1}{t+2}, \quad y := \frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^{t+1}}{t+1}. \quad (5.6)$$

Define z as a root of

$$\eta(z) = z \frac{t+1}{t+2} \quad \text{or} \quad 1 - e^{-z} = z \frac{t+4/3}{t+2}. \quad (5.7)$$

Since $1 - e^{-1} < 2/3$, equation (5.7) has a (unique) root $z = z(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Using $1 - e^{-z} \geq z - z^2/2$, we obtain

$$z(t) \geq \frac{4/3}{t+2}.$$

Inequality (5.6) holds if $y \leq z(t)$, which is certainly so because

$$y(t) \leq \frac{2/3}{t+1} \leq \frac{4/3}{t+2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

and from here the lemma follows. $\square$

Thus on the event Γ ,

$$B(t) \geq \hat{k} \implies B(t+1) \geq (n-1) \frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^{t+1}}{t+2}. \quad (5.8)$$

Lemma 5.4. *On the event Γ ,*

$$\tau(\hat{k}) \geq \frac{\ln^2 n}{20\sqrt{\lambda(n)}} = c^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Let the event Γ hold. By (5.8), and the definition of $\tau(\cdot)$, $\hat{\tau} := \tau(\hat{k})$ satisfies

$$\hat{k} \geq B(\hat{\tau}) \geq (n-1) \frac{2}{3} \frac{\gamma^{\hat{\tau}}}{\hat{\tau}+1}.$$

Recalling that $\hat{k} = n^{3/4}$, $\gamma = 1 - 2c^{1/2}$, and taking logarithms, we get

$$3c^{1/2}\hat{\tau} + \ln(\hat{\tau}+1) \geq \frac{1}{5} \ln n,$$

or

$$3 \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{\ln n} \hat{\tau} + \ln(\hat{\tau}+1) \geq \frac{1}{5} \ln n. \quad (5.9)$$

It then follows that for large enough n ,

$$\hat{\tau} \geq \frac{1}{4 \cdot 5} \frac{\ln^2 n}{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}} = c^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20},$$

as if it did not, then $\ln(\hat{\tau}+1) = o(\ln n)$ and

$$3 \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{\ln n} \hat{\tau} \leq \frac{3}{4 \cdot 5} \ln n < \ln n,$$

which together contradict (5.9) for n large enough. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.4. $\square$

In summary, on the event $\Gamma \cup \Pi$,

$$\tau(\hat{k}) \geq \min \left\{ c^{-3/2}, c^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20} \right\} = c^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20}.$$

Recalling that $P(\Gamma \cup \Pi) \rightarrow 1$, we conclude that

$$cE[\tau(1)] \geq cE[\tau(\hat{k})] \geq E[\tau(\hat{k}) I_{\Gamma \cup \Pi}] \geq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(n)}}{20} P(\Gamma \cup \Pi) \rightarrow \infty.$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.1. $\square$

6 Concluding remarks, future work

A generalization of this problem is to allow the probability of a ball going to a certain box to depend on its *origin* and not just on its *destination*; that is, if we have a ball in box i , it has probability p_{ij} of landing in box j for any $j \in [n]$, and these probabilities are not necessarily the same for all i . This is more difficult, as $\{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is no longer a Markov chain: we have to keep track of the *locations* of the balls at any time and not simply their number.

Coupling from the past algorithms involve running simultaneous coalescing flows on a Markov chain $P := (p_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ with stationary distribution π , and return samples distributed *exactly* according to π , at the time when all the flows coalesce. It would be very interesting to extend the

techniques in this paper to a more general case (when the rows of P are not necessarily all equal to some vector $\mathbf{p}$) in order to obtain an *upper* bound for the expected running time of such algorithms.

Here is an approach that appears promising. We start with a fixed allotment of one ball in each of n boxes, and for t_* times we run n independent allocations for each ball, where we do not fuse balls that land in the same box; call this a *mixing phase*. This t_* is to be taken large enough so that the location of each ball at time t_* is “almost” π -distributed. Then at time $t_* + 1$, we allocate the balls into the boxes but fuse any that collide (a *fusing allocation*). Continue alternating between mixing phases and fusing allocations until total coalescence has occurred; the coalescence time for this process should dominate the time for the usual process where we fuse colliding balls at every time. Moreover, if the locations of the balls at each fusing allocation are sufficiently independent and close to π -distributed, then we may be able to bring the results in this paper to bear on this more general case.

A Missing parts of the proof of Theorem 2.5

Lemma A.1. *Let $\chi = H_{rr}H_{zz} - H_{rz}^2$. Then $\chi > 0$ for all (z, r, b) on the curve C defined by (2.38) and (2.39).*

Proof. By the definition of H , we have

$$H_{zz} = \frac{b}{z^2} - \sum_j \frac{(e^{np_j r} - 1)^2}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$H_{rr} = \frac{k}{r^2} + z(1 - z)n^2 \sum_j \frac{p_j^2 e^{np_j r}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and

$$H_{rz} = n \sum_j \frac{p_j e^{np_j r}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We can recast (2.38) and (2.39) as

$$b = \sum_j \frac{z(e^{np_j r} - 1)}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)}, \quad k = nrz \sum_j \frac{p_j e^{np_j r}}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Using these in (A.1)-(A.3), we get that on C ,

$$H_{zz} = \frac{1}{z^2} \sum_j \frac{z(e^{np_j r} - 1)}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)} - \sum_j \frac{(e^{np_j r} - 1)^2}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$H_{rr} = \frac{nz}{r} \sum_j \frac{p_j e^{np_j r}}{1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)} + z(1 - z)n^2 \sum_j \frac{p_j^2 e^{np_j r}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2},$$

and now (A.5) simplifies to

$$H_{zz} = \frac{1}{z} \sum_j \frac{(e^{np_j r} - 1)}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For H_{rr} we can put under a common denominator and get

$$H_{rr} = \sum_j \frac{nz p_j e^{np_j r} (1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1)) + rz(1 - z)n^2 p_j^2 e^{np_j r}}{r(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}.$$

Using the inequality $e^x - 1 \geq x$ gives

$$H_{rr} \geq \sum_j \frac{nz p_j e^{np_j r} (1 + z n p_j r) + rz(1 - z) n^2 p_j^2 e^{np_j r}}{r(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2},$$

which then leads to some very convenient cancelling (in particular, of the z^2 term) to get

$$H_{rr} \geq \sum_j \frac{nz p_j e^{np_j r} (1 + r n p_j)}{r(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Multiply (A.6) and (A.7) together:

$$H_{zz} H_{rr} \geq \frac{n}{r} \left(\sum_j \frac{(e^{np_j r} - 1)}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2} \right) \left(\sum_j \frac{p_j e^{np_j r} (1 + r n p_j)}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2} \right),$$

and use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get

$$H_{zz} H_{rr} \geq \frac{n}{r} \left(\sum_j \frac{[(e^{np_j r} - 1) p_j (1 + n p_j r) e^{np_j r}]^{1/2}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2} \right)^2. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We need to show that this is strictly greater than H_{rz}^2 , which can be expressed, using (A.3), as

$$H_{rz}^2 = n^2 \left(\sum_j \frac{p_j e^{np_j r}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2} \right)^2. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Taking square roots of the expressions (A.8) and (A.9), the condition $\chi > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_j \frac{[(e^{np_j r} - 1) p_j (1 + n p_j r) e^{np_j r}]^{1/2} - \sqrt{r n} p_j e^{np_j r}}{(1 + z(e^{np_j r} - 1))^2} > 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

For (A.10) to hold, it suffices that each summand is nonnegative (and at least one strictly positive). Multiplying the numerators by $\sqrt{r n}$, we need to show that $\forall j, 1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$[(e^{np_j r} - 1) n p_j r (1 + n p_j r) e^{np_j r}]^{1/2} - r n p_j e^{np_j r} \geq 0.$$

This is equivalent to showing that $\forall j$,

$$f(n p_j r) \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where we define $f(x) = (e^x - 1)x(1 + x)e^x - x^2 e^{2x}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= x e^{2x} + x^2 e^{2x} - x e^x - x^2 e^x - x^2 e^{2x} \\ &= x e^{2x} - x e^x - x^2 e^x = x e^x (e^x - 1 - x) > 0 \quad \text{for } x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the inequalities in (A.11) hold (and at least one of them is strict), and so the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma A.2. *With $h(b)$ as defined in (2.40), we have, uniformly for $b \leq k$,*

$$h''(b) \leq -\frac{1}{k}.$$

Proof. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} h''(b) &= \frac{d}{db} (h'(b)) = \frac{d}{db} (-\ln(z(b))) && \text{by (2.43)} \\ &= -z'(b)/z(b). \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

To find $z'(b)$, differentiate $H_z(z(b), r(b), b) = 0$ and $H_r(z(b), r(b), b) = 0$ with respect to b ; we can solve for $z'(b)$ in this system (using $H_{rb} = 0, H_{zb} = -1/z$) to get

$$z'(b) = \frac{H_{rr}}{z(b)(H_{zz}H_{rr} - H_{rz}^2)} = \frac{H_{rr}}{z(b)\chi}, \tag{A.13}$$

which is strictly positive by (A.7) and Lemma A.1. Now note that, using the expression (A.6) for H_{zz} , and (A.4) to express b ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_{zz}}{b} &= \frac{1}{z(b)^2 b} \sum_j \frac{z(b)(e^{np_j r(b)} - 1)}{[1 + z(b)(e^{np_j r(b)} - 1)]^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{z(b)^2 b} \sum_j \frac{z(b)(e^{np_j r(b)} - 1)}{1 + z(b)(e^{np_j r(b)} - 1)} = \frac{1}{z(b)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

Therefore, using (A.12), (A.13), and (A.14),

$$h''(b) = -\frac{z'(b)}{z(b)} = -\frac{H_{rr}}{z(b)^2 \chi} \leq \frac{-H_{rr}H_{zz}}{b\chi} \leq -\frac{1}{b},$$

where the last inequality holds because $0 < \chi < H_{rr}H_{zz}$. Using the fact that $b \leq k$, $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k) \leq k$, and $\tilde{b}$ is between b and $\Phi_{\mathbf{p}}(k)$, we obtain

$$h''(\tilde{b}) \leq -\frac{1}{k}.$$

□

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to the participants of a student workshop on combinatorial probability at Ohio State University for many productive discussions of this project. We would also like to thank an anonymous reviewer for many insightful corrections and suggestions that greatly helped us improve the presentation of the paper.

References

- [1] ADLER, I., AHN, H. S., KARP, R. M. AND ROSS, S. M. (2003) Coalescing times for IID random variables with applications to population biology. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **23**, 155–166.
- [2] DALAL, A. AND SCHMUTZ, E. (2002) Compositions of random functions on a finite set. *Electr. J. Comb.* **9**(1).
- [3] DONNELLY, P. AND TAVARÉ, S. (1995) Coalescents and genealogical structure under neutrality. *Ann. Rev. Genet.* **29**, 401–421.
- [4] FILL, J. (2002) On compositions of random functions on a finite set. Unpublished paper, available at <http://www.mts.jhu.edu/~fill/papers/compositions.ps>.
- [5] FRIEZE, A. AND GRIMMETT, G. (1985) The shortest-path problem for graphs with random arc-lengths. *Discr. Appl. Math.* **10**, 57–77.
- [6] GOH, W., HITCZENKO, P. AND SCHMUTZ, E. (2006) Iterating random functions on a finite set. Unpublished paper, available at <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0207.5276>.
- [7] KINGMAN, J. F. C. (1982) On the genealogy of large populations. *Essays in Statistical Science*, ed. J. GANI AND E. J. HANNAN, 27–43. Applied Probability Trust, London. (Also as *Journal of Applied Probability* **19A**, 27–43.)

- [8] KINGMAN, J. F. C. (1982) The coalescent. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **13**, 235–248.
- [9] KINGMAN, J. F. C. (1982) Exchangeability and the evolution of large populations. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Exchangeability in Probability and Statistics, Rome, 6th-9th April 1981*, KOCH, G. AND SPIZZICHINO, F. eds, 97–112. North-Holland Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- [10] KNUTH, D., MOTWANI, R. AND PITTEL, B. (1990) Stable husbands. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **1**, 1–14.
- [11] MITZENMACHER, M. AND UPFAL, E. (2005) *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*, Cambridge University Press.
- [12] MÖHLE, M. (1998) Robustness results for the coalescent. *J. Appl. Prob.* **35**, 438–447.
- [13] MÖHLE, M. (2004) The time back to the most recent common ancestor in exchangeable population models. *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **36**, 78–97.
- [14] MÖHLE, M. AND SAGITOV, S. (2001) A classification of coalescent processes for haploid exchangeable population models. *Ann. Prob.* **29**, 1547–1562.
- [15] PITMAN, J. (1999) Coalescents with multiple collisions. *Ann. Prob.* **27** (4), 1870–1902.
- [16] PITTEL, B. (1987) On spreading a rumor. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **47** (1), 213–223.
- [17] PROPP, J. AND WILSON, D. (1996) Exact sampling with coupled Markov chains and applications to statistical mechanics. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **9**, 223–252.
- [18] PROPP, J. AND WILSON, D. (1998) How to get a perfectly random sample from a generic Markov chain and generate a random spanning tree of a directed graph. *J. of Algorithms* **27**, 170–217.
- [19] SAGITOV, S. (1999) The general coalescent with asynchronous mergers of ancestral lines. *J. Appl. Prob.* **36**, 1116–1125.
- [20] SCHWEINSBERG, J. (2000) Coalescents with simultaneous multiple collisions. *Electron. J. Probab.* **5**, 1–50.